

REMARKS

Claims 1-33, 59-62 and 64-121 are now pending in the application. Claims 34-58 have been canceled. Claims 1, 59 and 89 are independent claims.

Claims 1-62 and 64-88 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,662,192 (Rebane) and Claims 89-121 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rebane in view of US Patent 6,487,538 (Gupta et al.).

Each of the rejections is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rebane is directed to a website response measurement tool to collect user reaction to a particular website. A user reaction feedback mechanism obtains a user's reaction to the content, design and usability of the webpage he is currently viewing and provides a report indicating such feedback to the website owner.

More particularly, Rebane's presentation server 26 hosts an 'infomediary website' that consumers can access via the network. The 'infomediary website' then includes "web pages having a list or table of merchant websites...displayed to a consumer by the consumer selecting '*desired categories*' from a menu on the web page" (see col. 31, line 62- col. 32, line 7, and Fig. 16, of Rebane).

A method or system for providing an evaluation of a plurality of information sites to a user over a packet-switched network, in accordance with Applicants' teachings, operates as follows: when the user submits a search request through a user interface device in communication with the packet-switched network, the method acquires a search result, responsive to the search request, which includes network addresses for the plurality of information sites; selects a plurality of individuals who were previously in communication with at least one of the information sites over the packet-switched network and who meet at least one predefined criterion selected by the user; retrieves from a database a plurality of evaluations of at least one of the information sites, the evaluations being provided by the plurality of individuals; and forwards a rating based on said evaluations to the user over the packet-switched network.

With respect to Claim 1 for example, the Office Action takes the position that "Rebane discloses, acquiring a search result (survey questionnaire), responsive to the search request" and directs Applicants to "fig. 1a-g, col. 8, lines 61-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 10, lines 1-54, col. 13, lines 21-67 to col. 14, lines 1-46".

Applicants submit that the “survey questionnaire” of Rebane does not teach or even suggest the method/system of Applicants Claim 1, in which a “search result, responsive to a search request submitted through a user interface device in communication with the packet-switched network, includes *network addresses* for the *plurality of information sites*”.

The Action acknowledges that “Rebane does not explicitly disclose network address for the plurality of information sites...[h]owever, the network address for the information sites is URL (network address) and Rebane discloses URL (such as Outpost.com, Ecost.com, etc., and all are Internet addresses that are provided to users...therefore, it would have been obvious...to include network address for the plurality of information sites in the system of Rebane”.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis, and submit that Rebane’s “infomediary website”, provides absolutely no teaching or suggestion of obtaining a plurality of network addresses for a plurality of sites in response to a search request over the packet-switched network.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent Claims 1 and 59 is patentable over Rebane, and that independent Claim 89, which includes the limitations of Claims 1 and 59 discussed above, is patentable over Rebane and Gupta.

Dependent Claims 2-33, 60-62, 64-88 and 90-121 are believed to be clearly patentable for all of the reasons indicated above with respect to Claims 1, 59 and 89, one or another from which they depend, and even further distinguish over Rebane by reciting additional limitations.

For example, dependent Claims 29 and 84 recite that the search request is a key word search request. The only key word search request in Rebane is performed *within* the infomediary website.

And, again Applicants note that dependent Claims 25, 80 and 113 recite that the step of forwarding an advertisement is a separate step from that of forwarding a rating, and Claims 28 and 83 recite that *the advertisement is selected based at least in part on user information located in the database*. Rebane fails to teach or suggest these elements.

It is respectfully submitted that in regard to the above amendment and remarks that the pending application is patentable over the art of record and reconsideration is accordingly requested. Should the Examiner be of the view that an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the application at large, request is kindly made that the Examiner

telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney at (908) 518-7700 in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Karin L. Williams

Registration No. 36,721

Certificate of Mail

I hereby certify that this document and any document referenced herein is being deposited with the US Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and addressed to
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 23, 2004

Karin L. Williams, Reg. No. 36,721

(Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)


(Signature)

Please Continue To Send Correspondence to:

Mayer, Fortkort & Williams PC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield, NJ 07090

(908) 518-7700
(908) 518-7795 fax